

REMARKS**Priority:**

The Office Action asserts that acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on 10/18/2000, but that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 318138/2000 application. Applicant points out that a certified copy of the priority document was filed on January 7, 2002 along with a petition of claiming to convention priority. Applicant received a return post card from the U.S. Patent Office on which the date of February 8, 2002 was stamped by OIPE indicating receipt by the U.S. Patent Office of the certified priority document (copy of postcard attached). Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge of the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Claim Status:

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1-21 are rejected. Of the rejected claims, claims 1 and 18 are independent. By this amendment, claims 1 and 18 have been amended.

Objection to Drawings:

The Office Action objects the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) with the assertion that the drawings lack of showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Office Action asserts that the "pixel mirror not tilted (claim 2)" and the "aperture (claim 5)" must be shown in the drawings. Applicant has amended Fig. 1 by indicating the aperture as numeral "10" and added new drawing Fig. 2C showing the structure in which the pixel mirror is not tilted. These amendments are supported by the original description of the specification and no new matter has been added.

The Office Action also objects Fig. 3 by asserting that it should be designated by a legend such as "PRIOR ART." In response to the Examiner's suggestion, Applicant has amended Fig. 3 by designating it as "PRIOR ART."

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to approve these proposed amended drawings, and to withdraw the objection to the Drawings.

Objection to Specification:

The Office Action objects the specification by asserting that the abstract exceeds 150 words in length and the titled of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants have been amended the abstract and the title. Applicants believe that these amendments remove the objection and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw such objection.

Amendments:

In the specification, the abstract has been amended by replacing the rewritten abstract which satisfies the requirement for its length. The title in the specification has been amended to more clearly describe the invention. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

As shown in the accompanying Request For Examiner Approval Of Proposed Amended Drawings, Applicant herein amends Figs 1 and 3 and add new Fig. 2C. In amended Fig. 1, the numeral 10 has been added to refer the aperture. This amendment is supported by the original description in the specification, for example, page 13, lines 1-9. Fig. 2C has been added to the Drawings. Fig. 2C shows the feature recited in claim 2 and this amendment is supported by the original description in the specification, for example, page 6, lines 10-12 as well as the original claim 2. In amended Fig.3, a legend "PRIOR ART" has been added. This amendment is supported by the original description in page 3, lines 10-11 of the specification.

As discussed, no new matter has been added by adding the new drawing Fig. 2C and its explanation or the changes to Fig. 1. In the specification, according to the addition of new drawing Fig. 2C, the paragraph beginning at page 9, line 25 has been amended to insert the explanation of Fig. 2C, and the paragraph beginning at page 11, line 7 has been amended to amend for referring the new drawing. Also, in the specification, according to the amendment of Fig. 1 by adding the numeral "10" indicating the aperture, the paragraphs beginning at page 13, line 1, beginning at page 13, line 14 , and beginning at page 15, line 8 have been amended to

refer the numeral "10." No new matter has been added by these amendments to the Specification.

Claim Rejection Under § 103:

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,188,529 to Koyama et al. ("Koyama") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,760,947 to Kim et al. ("Kim"). Koyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,529) is a division of application No. 08/965,049, which has matured as U.S. Patent No. 5,999,334, issued on December 7, 1999.

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Claim 1 has been amended by reciting "an illumination optical system for radiating illumination light." Support for this amendment may be found in the original description through the specification, for example the paragraph beginning at page 4, line 3. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended by reciting "said mirror array device separating said illumination light from said illumination optical system to a plurality of color lights, and reflecting said plurality of color lights to the respective directions different from each others" (claim 1) and "said mirror array device separates illumination light from an illumination optical system to a plurality of color lights, and reflects said plurality of color lights to the respective directions different from each others so as to form an image" (claim 18). Support for these amendments may be found in the original description of the specification, for example from page 10, line 23 through page 12, line 6 as well as Fig. 2A. No new matter has been added by these amendments to the claims.

Koyama discloses that illumination light from a light source is separated to a plurality of color lights by a diffraction gratings (or a plurality dichroic mirrors tilted with a certain interval), each of separated color lights is modulated by being made incident into corresponding each liquid crystal panel, the modulated color lights are synthesized, and the synthesized color lights are projected.

Kim discloses a mirror array in which each mirror in array is capable of changing the tilt direction thereof, and discloses the used of the mirror to the video display.

The Office Action alleges that it is obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the mirror array device disclosed in Kim in substitution of the plurality of mirrors from Koyama to

constitute the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this allegation. Applicants point out that the deflection means disclosed in Koyama is an arrangement for reflecting and guiding **one color light** modulated by the light modulating element to the projection optical system. Thus, even if the mirror array disclosed in Kim is used as the deflection means disclosed in Koyama, **only the deflection of one color light** can be changed. On the other hand, in the claimed invention, the mirror array device separates the illumination light from the illumination optical system to a plurality of color lights, and reflects the plurality of color lights to the respective directions different from each others. Therefore, the combination of Koyama and Kim neither suggest nor teach the claimed invention.

Moreover, In Koyama, a white light is separated into three, R, B and G color by a color separation element (3), and then the R light is reflected by mirrors (5, 10, 11 and 20), the B light is reflected by mirrors (6, 12, 13 and 21), and **the G light passes mirrors (20 and 21)**, before entering a projecting optical system (22). That is, in Koyama, the R and B lights are reflected by mirrors while the G light passes mirrors without being reflected. Koyama expressly states that after the sentence in column 7, lines 10-11, which the Examiner cites in the Office Action, “The second deflection means has a plurality of mirrors arranged tilted at an interval, and **at least one of the plurality of color light components passes between the mirrors arranged at an interval** and is incident on the projection optical system. (emphasis added). Thus, Applicants points out that the express statement in Koyama teaches away the combination of Koyama and Kim to make the claimed invention in which all three colors, R, B and G are reflected by the mirror.

Thus, for at least reasons stated above, the amended claims 1 and 18 are believed to be neither taught nor suggested by the cited art, taken alone or in combination and thus patentably distinct from the art of record.

Applicant has not individually addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicant believes that, as the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are allowable for at least those reasons as discussed above, the dependent claims are allowable for at least similar reasons. Applicant, however, reserves the right to address such rejections of the dependent claims should be necessary.

If any outstanding issue remains, however, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

CONCLUSION

Based on the forgoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the timely consideration of this amendment under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4780.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: July 7, 2003

By:


Stephen Manetta
Registration No. 40,426

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile